

Thank you for your participation in this year's Consolidated Innovative Nuclear Research FOA. To complete your reviews, please click on the link that will take you to the [Log In](#) page.

The screenshot shows a 'Log In' form with the following elements:

- Log In** (Section Header)
- User Name:** [Text Input Field]
- Password:** [Text Input Field]
- ☐ Remember me next time.
- Log In** (Button)
- [Create New Account](#)
- [Forgot Password?](#)
- [Forgot UserName?](#)

Annotations:

- A large purple arrow points from the text **Insert User Name and Password here** to the User Name and Password input fields.
- A purple arrow points from the text **To retrieve Log In credentials, click the appropriate link** to the links [Forgot Password?](#) and [Forgot UserName?](#).

When you have successfully logged in, you will need to click on the “Reviews” tab just below the NEUP logo in the upper left hand corner of your screen. This will bring you to the “Your Reviews” page. Before you begin, please view the document links to view specific reviewer restrictions, and read the conflict of interest information. You do not need to sign the form, simply click the box that says “I agree” at the bottom.

Your Reviews



Please read through the DOE Peer Reviewer Conflict of Interest form. **You must indicate your acceptance by checking the box below before you may do any reviews.**

[Non Federal Employee COI Form](#)

[Federal Employee COI Form](#)

[Examples of Possible or Apparent Conflicts](#)

[FY 2014 Procurement Integrity](#)

Please read and understand the instructions in each link.

Use the “Review Filter” (below) to select the appropriate call for which you are a reviewer. Only those reviews (technical or relevancy by proposal) that are assigned to you will be displayed. Select links to the proposal and associated documents will be displayed in addition to scoring and comment input areas.

You may perform a partial review of a proposal and save your work at any time by using the “Save” button located at the bottom of the screen. If you save a review, you will note that the status is “In Progress”. As a review is complete, please click “submit” and the status of the proposal will change to “submitted.”

Please review the proposals as early as possible so that they can be reassigned should you determine that you have a conflict of interest. In addition, please be professional in your comments, as help them improve their applications for future submissions. Comments must be submitted for each criterion as requested.

Federal Employees-

I certify that I will not disclose, except pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction, any information concerning the assessment and analysis or the content of applications/proposals for review or at any subsequent time, to anyone who is not authorized access to the information by the Department of Energy or by law or regulation, and then only to the extent that such disclosure is necessary in the performance of my official responsibilities. Furthermore, I will report to the DOE Official responsible for the process any communication concerning the assessment and analysis or the individuals in activities directed to me from any source outside this process.

Non Federal Employees-

Whenever DOE furnishes any FOIA information to me, I agree to use such information only for official FOIA purposes, including conducting the review, and to treat the information obtained from DOE as confidential information for my own private gain or the private gain of others. This requirement for confidential treatment applies to information obtained from any source, including the submitter, with the exception of information that is in the public domain. The submitter of the information shall be conspicuously affixed to any reproduction or abstract thereof and its provisions strictly complied with. Upon the DOE office that initially furnished such information or I will destroy the files (paper and electronic) and certify to the Contracting Officer that I have done so.

Procurement Integrity

I certify that I have read and understand the FY 2014 Procurement Integrity slides provided.

☒ I agree

Click to agree

Review Filters

-- Select a Call Filter --

Select the R&D call for the current year.

To view your list of reviews, please click the filter and Select the “FY 2014 Request for R&D Full Applications” as shown above.

When you get to this point, please take a moment to familiarize yourself with the table that lists your proposals. These are all in the area that you are listed as either the Federal POC or the Technical POC. Below is an example of a relevancy assignment for a proposal in FC-1.1. Before you click the “Review” button, please look at the information as you may need to use it in your review. For example, columns four and five capture participation of an Underrepresented Group (URG) and for a Minority Serving Institution (MSI) which you will be asked to give extra consideration for during the review. The last three columns simply tell you what type of review it is, the status of it (New, Working, Submitted), and the date you were assigned. Please see the screen shot below:

☒ I agree

Review Filters

FY 2013 Request for R&D Pre-Application -- No area filter --

Select a Proposal to Review

Drag a column header and drop it here to group by that column

	Tracking ID	Proposal Title	Final Scope	MSI	URG	Review Type	Review Status	Assigned Date
Review	RPA-13-4903	Reproductive Cells and Computational Simulation for Underrepresented Minority Institutions Separations	FC-1.1: Electrochemical Separations	Yes	No	RPA Program Supporting Relevancy	New	1/29/2013 3:27:23 PM

Page: 1 of 1 Go Page size: 1 Change Item 1 to 1 of 1

Please select the Review Link at the left to begin your review. You should see something like the screen shot below:



Proposal Details

[Pin to top](#)

[CFA-14-2431 Simulation and Testing Techniques to Support Online Monitoring and Facilitation of NPP Security](#)

[Your pre-app review](#)

You Pre Application score and Comments

This is a link to the application page where you can find additional information.

	Attachment Type	Attachment Name	File Size	File Upload Date	Content Type
View	Benefit of Collaborations		193214	4/3/2014 1:15:33 PM	application/pdf
View	Current Pending Support		178343	4/3/2014 12:52:18 PM	application/pdf
View	Budget Justification		158770	4/3/2014 3:03:52 PM	application/pdf
View	Technical Abstract		97520	4/3/2014 1:31:46 PM	application/pdf
View	Technical Proposal		324715	4/3/2014 3:08:13 PM	application/pdf
View	Pricing		72312	4/3/2014 1:16:56 PM	application/vnd.oper
View	Capabilities		194682	4/3/2014 12:49:13 PM	application/pdf
View	Principal Investigator Vita		211631	4/2/2014 7:28:22 AM	application/pdf
View	Technical Expertise an		205055	4/3/2014 2:56:52 PM	application/pdf

Links to the documents

MSI Status
No involvement

URG Status
PI has indicated they **do not** represent an underrepresented group

Provides the details of the Minority Serving Institution (MSI) or, if the PI has designated, the Underrepresented Group (URG). Use this information as part of the "Diverse Partnerships".

Conflicted

If at any point in this review you feel there is a conflict of interest or a perceived conflict of interest with you performing this review please return to this section, give a descriptive

500 characters or less description of conflict.

Conflicted

If you have a conflict, please identify it and explain in the box provided. Once you declare, it will notify the NEUP Integration Office and you will be locked out of the review.

Criteria

Please respond to the following criteria:

Program Supporting Relevancy

Relevance (35%): Mission-relevance; aligned with technical objectives; advances the state of the knowledge within the program element; does not duplicate previously funded interest" in the supplementary information for a list of currently funded projects).

- ☐ **Highly Relevant/High Program Priority:** The proposal is fully supportive of, and has significant and demonstrable ties to, the relevant program element(s) or mission.
- ☐ **Relevant/Intermediate Program Priority:** The proposal is supportive of, and has significant and demonstrable ties to, the relevant program element(s) or mission.
- ☐ **Low Relevance/Low Program Priority:** The proposal is minimally supportive of, and difficult to tie to, the relevant program element(s) or mission.
- ☐ **Not Relevant/No Program Priority:** The proposal is not supportive of the relevant program element(s) or mission – OR – sufficient work is already being performed.

Diverse Partnerships

The degree to which underrepresented groups (URG), minority-serving institutions (MSI), international and/or industry partners, if any, contribute to the proposal's ability to successfully complete the mission. (note: partnerships are not required for projects to be evaluated as unquestionably relevant, but partnerships will increase relevancy score.

- ☐ 5 - Outstanding partnership contribution: Partnership organization has a significant role in the proposed work, significant relevant expertise, outstanding record/reputation strength in accomplishing assigned goals.
- ☐ 3 - Effective partnership contribution: Partner organization has meaningful role in the proposed work, appropriate expertise, and has a known record/reputation of accomplishment.
- ☐ 1 - Moderate partnership contribution: Partner organization has measurable role in the proposed work, some expertise, and has an unknown record/reputation of accomplishment.
- ☐ 0 - No partnerships.

Save often or cut and paste comments from a word or text file so you don't lose your work.

If you have any questions or concerns, please email me at Drew.Thomas@inl.gov, or reach me by phone at 208.526.1602. Thank you in advance for your time and effort in performing these reviews.